FILED
SEP 21 1928
CHARLES ELMORE CROPLEY
CLERK

IN THE

# Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1928

No. [redacted] 65

ALBERT S. WILLIAMS, Commissioner of Finance of the State of Tennessee, L. D. SMITH, Attorney General of the State of Tennessee, and R. M. ATKINSON, District Attorney General,

APPELLANTS,

*Against*

THE TEXAS COMPANY,

APPELLEE.

On Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Tennessee.

## Brief and Argument on Behalf of Appellants, Officials of the State of Tennessee.

L. D. SMITH,
Attorney General of Tennessee.

H. N. LEECH,
J. J. LYNCH,
CHARLES T. CATES, JR.,
Attorneys for Appellants.

McQUIDDY PRINTING CO., NASHVILLE

IN THE

# Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1928

## No. 764

**ALBERT S. WILLIAMS, Commissioner of Finance of the State of Tennessee, L. D. SMITH, Attorney General of the State of Tennessee, and R. M. ATKINSON, District Attorney General,**

APPELLANTS,

*Against*

**THE TEXAS COMPANY,**

APPELLEE.

**On Appeal from the District Court of the United States for the Middle District of Tennessee.**

**Brief and Argument on Behalf of Appellants, Officials of the State of Tennessee.**


**L. D. SMITH,**
**Attorney General of Tennessee.**

**H. N. LEECH,**
**J. J. LYNCH,**
**CHARLES T. CATES, JR.,**
**Attorneys for Appellants.**


McQUIDDY PRINTING CO., NASHVILLE

## SUBJECT INDEX.


PAGE

I. TWO VITAL QUESTIONS DECIDED AGAINST THE STATE OF TENNESSEE BY THE DISTRICT COURT..... 1- 2

1. That the State of Tennessee is without power to regulate the price of gasoline sold within her borders, so as to allow dealers in gasoline to exact only reasonable prices therefor..... 1

2. That the State is without power to require a foreign corporation, as a condition of its doing business within the State, to furnish information in regard to the conduct of its business within the State ..... 2

II. HISTORY OF THE CASE..... 2-21

1. Price war, rebates and discriminations in the gasoline industry in Tennessee..... 2- 3

2. Governor's message to the General Assembly recommending regulatory legislation ..... 3- 4

3. Legislation complained of and held invalid by the District Court .....4-5, 72-80

4. Original Injunction Bill filed challenging constitutionality of the Act..... 5- 6

5. Answer and motion to dismiss the bill..... 6-21

(1) Motion to dismiss upon the ground that the Act challenged is a valid, constitutional enactment of the State of Tennessee..... 6- 7

(2) Answer of defendants in Court below... 7-21

(a) The Standard Oil Company of Louisiana is, in effect, the same corporate interest as the Standard Oil Company of Kentucky which was ousted from doing business in the State of Tennessee by decree of Supreme Court of that State, affirmed by this Court..... 7-11

(b) Complainant has confederated with and aided and abetted the Standard Oil Company in monopolizing the gasoline industry in Tennessee 8-11

(c) The gasoline industry in Tennessee is affected with, and has been devoted to a public use and therefore, is subject to the regulatory police power of the State ..... 11-21




J6012

PAGE

(d) The gasoline industry in Tennessee is monopolized and controlled by the principal dealers in said State, and is, therefore, subject to the regulatory police power of the State.... 11-21

6. Opinion and Decree of the District Court... 21-22

(1) That because of threatened prosecutions, complainant in the Court below was entitled to an injunction ..... 21

(2) That the price-fixing provisions of the Act are invalid ..... 21

(3) That the price-fixing provisions constituted the main purpose of the Act, and that therefore the whole Act was void..... 21-22

(4) And the Court so decreed..... 22

7. Substitution of Commissioner of Finance and Taxation, Williams, successor in office of F. S. Hall, one of the original defendants, and an appeal prayed and granted..... 22

III. ASSIGNMENTS OF ERROR ..... 22-23

1. The District Court erred in holding that the Act of 1927 challenged by the bill was unconstitutional because said Act is a valid and proper exercise of the police power of the State, in its declared purpose to prevent monopoly and extortion in the prices of gasoline..... 22-23

2. That the Act is a valid and proper regulation of the gasoline industry in Tennessee, because said industry is affected with a public interest. 23

3. That the Act challenged is within the just and reserved police powers of the State to regulate and fix prices for the sale and distribution within the State, of gasoline,—a commodity affected with and devoted to the public interest.. 23

4. That even if the price-fixing provisions of the Act should be held invalid, the other regulatory provisions of the Act, intended to remedy the evils recited and set forth in the Act are severable from the body of the Act and should be sustained ..... 23

5. No injunction should have been issued because the Oil Companies had a plain, adequate and complete remedy at law..... 23

PAGE

IV. PROPOSITIONS OF LAW..... 24-52

1. (a) The Standard Oil Company of Louisiana, in respect of their intra-state business in Tennessee, is, in fact and in law, the same interests represented by the Standard Oil Company of Kentucky, ousted from doing business in said State, and is not alwfully entitled to carry on its business therein or to complain of the Act of 1927..... 24

(b) The appellee herein is allied with and combined with the Standard Oil Company in monopolizing and controlling the sale of gasoline in Tennessee at unreasonable and unjust prices, and therefore not entitled to carry on its business therein and attack the Act of 1927..... 24

Cases sustaining said propositions of law..... 24

2. A foreign corporation is not entitled to carry on its business in any State except by complying with the conditions prescribed by such State... 25-26

Cases sustaining said proposition of law..... 25-26

3. Courts take cognizance of all matters of general knowledge, and may make use of its knowledge of facts with which they have become familiar by a series of preceding cases..... 27-28

Cases sustaining said proposition of law..... 27-28

4. Every presumption and reasonable intendment is in favor of the constitutionality of the Act ..... 28-30

(a) Brown vs. Maryland, 12 Wheat., 436.... 28

(b) Sinking Fund Cases, 99 U. S., 718..... 28

(c) Arizona Copper Co. vs. Hammer, 250 U. S., 400 ..... 28- 9

(d) Knoxville vs. Knoxville Water Co., 212 U. S., 8 ..... 29

(e) Adkins vs. Children's Hospital, 261 U. S., 525, 544 ..... 29-30

Other cases sustaining said propositions of law 30

5. Upon the facts disclosed in the record the gasoline industry in Tennessee has been devoted to and is clothed with a public interest, and the

PAGE

legislation complained of was enacted in the proper exercise of the police power of the State 30

Cases sustaining said proposition of law..... 30

V. ARGUMENT IN SUPPORT OF THE FIFTH PROPOSITION OF LAW, SUPRA..... 30-51

1. To what does the police power of the State extend? It has never been limited by express definition ..... 30-34

(a) Cooley on Constitutional Limitations... 31

(b) People vs. Budd, 117 N. Y., 1..... 31-32

(c) Tennessee cases supporting the doctrine that the police power extends to the safety, health, morals, comfort, and welfare of the people, and expands to meet new conditions ..... 32

(d) Federal cases supporting the doctrine above stated ..... 32-34

In re: Rahrer, 140 U. S., 554..... 32-33

Wolff vs. Industrial Court 262 U. S., 522..... 33-34

Rail & River Co. vs. Yappell, 236 U. S., 338.... 34

2. Facts relied upon showing that the gasoline industry is clothed with a public interest are not denied by appellee, complainant in the Court below ..... 35

3. Summary of facts and conditions showing that the gasoline industry is a monopoly in Tennessee and has been devoted to, and is affected with a public interest..... 35

(1) Matters of common knowledge of which the Court takes cognizance..... 35-40

(a) Mennen Co. vs. Federal Trade Commission, Fed. Rep., 774, 778, 779, reviewing illegal practices of corporations, such as the Standard Oil Company and its subsidiaries, in mopolizing and controlling prices .....35-36-37

(2) The judicial history of the petroleum industry showing, as portrayed by the decisions of the State and Federal Courts, an unrelenting and unswerving determination on the part of

PAGE

the Standard Oil Companies to monopolize and control the entire industry in this country..... 37-38

(3) Dealers in gasoline in Tennessee have, in fact, a monopoly of that business, and facts supporting this proposition ..... 38

(4) Ouster from the State under the anti-Trust Acts enforced against the Standard Oil Company of Kentucky, did not and does not give relief to the people of Tennessee, hence the additional reason for controlling prices of gasoline—giving a fair price to the dealer, and a reasonable and fair price to the seller..... 38-39

(a) Report of Manufacturers' Committee of United States Senate to the effect that gasoline is essential to the life of industry and vital to the public,—that it is affected with a public interest and subject to regulations ..... 39-40

4. The Tennessee Act challenged by the Standard Oil Company and other Oil Companies in Tennessee is sustained by the decisions of this Court as a valid exercise of the State's police power ..... 40-51

(a) The case of Tyson vs. Banton, 264 U. S., 140, upon which the learned District Court predicated its holding, and the case of Fairmont Creamery Co. vs. Minnesota, 274 U. S., 1, and Ribnik vs. McBride, decided by this Court on May 28, 1928, relied upon by appellee, cited and distinguished from the facts and principle controlling in this case..... 41

(b) The principles announced and enforced in the Munn case (94 U. S., 113) and Wolff case (262 U. S., 522) predicated in a large measure upon the Allnut case (12 East, 527), sustains the Tennessee Act upon the grounds:

(1) The gasoline industry in Tennessee has been carried on and is being carried on in such a manner as makes it of utmost public consequence affecting the community ..... 42

(2) Dealers in the gasoline industry without a grant or governmental franchise, have

PAGE

a virtual monopoly of the sale and distribution of gasoline in Tennessee..... 42-51

5. The Munn case is the guide-post..... 42-43

(a) Allnut vs. Inglis, 12 East, 527, upon which the Munn case is largely predicated ..... 43-44

(b) The Wolff case,—its classifications of the businesses clothed with a public interest. 44-45

(c) The Van Dyke case (244 U. S., 39) following the Munn case, approvingly quotes:

"Property becomes clothed with a public interest when used in a manner to make it of public consequence and to affect the community at large"..... 46

(d) C. B. & Q. Ry. Co. vs. McGuire, 219 U. S., 549, holding when the Legislature has power to establish a regulation, it also has the power to prohibit contracts in derogation of such regulation ..... 47

(e) Noble State Bank vs. Haskel, 219 U. S., 104, declaring the limits to which the Legislature may go in regulating private business ..... 47

(f) The German Alliance Insurance Co. vs. Kansas, 233 U. S., 389, defining public uses ..... 48- 9

6. Proposition of law as follows:

Even if the price-fixing features of the Act complained of are held to be invalid, nevertheless the other regulatory features of the Act are valid, and should be sustained, as insisted in the fourth assignment of error..... 51

(1) Opinion of District Court to the effect that the other regulatory features of the Act fall with the price-fixing provisions. 51-52

(2) Argument in support of fourth assignment of error ..... 52-70

(a) The price-fixing provisions of the Act are but one of the remedies against the evils complained of as set forth in the bill, and it is manifest that the Legislature intended to assert its power to fully regu-

PAGE

late the gasoline industry by means and methods in addition to those included within the price-fixing provisions..... 52

(b) Some of the severable provisions of the Act analyzed, especially those relating to the collection of data and furnishing information ..... 52-70

(c) Application of the principle announced in Standard Oil Company vs. State, 217 U. S., 817, and the anti-Trust Act of 1903 to the conditions sought to be remedied by the challenged Act ..... 53-54

(d) The case of Weller vs. New York, 268 U. S., 319-322, construing the same statutes of New York involved in the Tyson case, supra, sustains the severable propositions of the Tennessee Act..... 55-59

(e) The cases of Hall vs. Geiger, 242 U. S., 538; Caldwell vs. Sioux Falls Co., 242 U. S., 558; and Merrick vs. Halsey, 242 U. S., 568, sustaining the Blue Sky Laws of Ohio, South Dakota and Michigan, sustains the principle and doctrine contended for in the Tennessee Act..... 59-61

7. The provisions of the Tennessee Act prohibiting rebating and discriminations are valid, and are sustained by the decisions of this Court.... 51-70

(1) Section of the Tennessee Act prohibiting rebating and discrimination ..... 61

Sustained by the following decisions of this Court:

Standard Oil case, 221 U. S., 1; Missouri Standard Oil case, 224 U. S., 761; Nash. vs. United States, 259 U. S., 274,

(2) It was for the offense denounced by said Section of the Tennessee Act that the Standard Oil Company of Kentucky representing the same interest as does appellee, was ousted from Tennessee as hereinbefore shown,—the decree of ouster being affirmed by this Court..... 61-62

(a) Central Lumber Co. vs. South Dakota, 226 U. S., 157..... 62-64

PAGE

(b) Fairmont Creamery Co. vs. Minnesota, 274 U. S., 1-11, analyzed ..... 64-65

(c) Crescent Cotton Oil Co. vs. Miss., 257 U. S., 129, analyzed and applied to this case 66-67

(d) Purity Extract Co. vs. Lynch, 226 U. S., 197, analyzed and applied to this case... 68-69

(e) Other severable provisions relating to differentials ..... 69-70

CONCLUSION ..... 71

APPENDIX,—Copy of Tennessee Act..... 72-80

## INDEX OF CASES CITED.


| | PAGE |
|---|---|
| Adkins vs. Children's Hospital, 261 U. S., 525, 544 | 29 |
| Ah Sin vs. Wittman, 198 U. S., 500, 504 | 68 |
| Allnut vs. Inglis, 12 East, 527, 539-42 | 30, 43 |
| American Sugar Refining Co. vs. Louisiana, 179 U. S., 89 | 25, 67 |
| Arizona Copper Co. vs. Hammer, 250 U. S., 400 (63 L. Ed., 1058) | 28 |
| Austin vs. State, 110 Tenn., 563, 566 | 27 |
| Baltic Mining Co. vs. Massachusetts, 231 U. S., 68, 83 | 25, 67 |
| Beal vs. Chase, 31 Mich., 490 | 25 |
| Block vs. Hirsch, 256 U. S., 135 | 45 |
| Booth vs. Illinois, 184 U. S., 425 | 68 |
| Brown vs. Maryland, 12 Wheaton, 436 | 28 |
| Brass vs. North Dakota, 153 U. S., 391 | 30 |
| Brass vs. Stoeser, 153 U. S., 391 | 45 |
| Brazee vs. Michigan, 241 U. S., 240 | 56 |
| Budd vs. New York, 143 U. S., 517, affirming 117 N. Y., 1 | 30, 45 |
| Caldwell vs. Sioux Co., 242 U. S., 558 | 25, 59 |
| Cargill Co. vs. Minnesota, 180 U. S., 452 | 25, 67 |
| Central Lumber Co. vs. South Dakota, 226 U. S., 157, 161 | 62 |
| C. B. & Q. R. R. Co. vs. McGuire, 219 U. S., 549 (55 L. Ed., 328) | 34, 47, 64 |
| Crescent Oil Co. vs. Mississippi, 257 U. S., 129 | 25, 66 |
| Dayton Coal, Iron, etc. Co. vs. Barton, 183 U. S., 23 (S. C., 103 Tenn., 604) | 30, 32 |
| Dillard & Coffin Co. vs. Richmond Oil Co., 140 Tenn., 298 | 25 |
| Dorchy vs. Kansas, 264 U. S., 286 | 56 |
| Fairmont Creamery Co. vs. Minnesota, 274 U. S., 1 | 41, 64 |
| Fort Smith Lumber Co. vs. Arkansas, 251 U. S., 532 | 25, 67 |
| German Alliance Insurance Co. vs. Lewis, 233 U. S., 389-91, 410, 411, 415-17 | 30, 34, 45, 48 |
| Green vs. Frazier, 253 U. S., 233 | 30 |

PAGE
Grenada Lumber Co. vs. Mississippi, 217 U. S., 433 442 ..... 64
Hall vs. Geiger, 242 U. S., 539..... 25, 59
Hammond Packing Co. vs. Arkansas, 212 U. S., 332, 343, 344 ..... 25, 67
Hannibal R. R. Co. vs. Husen, 95 U. S., 465..... 32
Honolulu Rapid Transit & Land Co. vs. Hawaii, 211 U. S., 282 ..... 29
Horn Silver Mining Co. vs. New York, 143 U. S., 305 25, 67
In re Rahrer, 140 U. S., 554..... 32
Jamison vs. Independent Natural Gas Co., 127 Ind., 555 ..... 27
Knight vs. U. S. Land Association, 142 U. S., 161... 27
Knoxville Iron Co. vs. Harbison, 183 U. S., 13 (S. C., 103 Tenn., 421) ..... 30, 32
Knoxville vs. Knoxville Water Co., 212 U. S., 8..... 29
Leeper vs. State, 103 Tenn., 500, 532..... 30, 32
Lemeiux vs. Young, 211 U. S., 489, 496..... 64
LePage Co. vs. Russia Cement Co., 51 Fed. Rep., 941 25
Lindsley vs. Natural Carbonic Gas Co., 220 U. S., 61 67
McGaskill vs. U. S., 216 U. S., 516..... 24
McLean vs. Arkansas, 211 U. S., 539..... 30, 34
Manufacturing Co. vs. Falls, 90 Tenn., 466..... 30
Mayor of New York vs. Miln, 11 Peters (U. S.), 139 32
Mennen Co. vs. Federal Trade Commission, 288 Fed. Rep., 774, 778, 779..... 35
Merrick vs. Halsey, 242 U. S., 569.....25, 59, 64
Middleton vs. Texas Power, etc. Co., 249 U. S., 152.. 30
Muller vs. Oregon, 208 U. S., 412..... 27
Munn vs. Illinois, 94 U. S., 113-154 .....30, 42, 45, 46
Murphy vs. California, 225 U. S., 623..... 68
Nash vs. U. S., 259 U. S., 273..... 62
New York, ex rel. Silz vs. Hesterburg, 211 U. S., 31. 68
Noble State Bank vs. Haskell, 219 U. S., 104..... 45, 47
Oklahoma Gin Co. vs. State, 252 U. S., 339..... 30
Oklahoma Natural Gas Co. vs. Oklahoma, 258 U. S., 234, 237, 239 ..... 30
Oklahoma Operating Co. vs. Love, 252 U. S., 331.... 30
Otis vs. Parker, 187 U. S., 606-9..... 64, 68
People vs. Budd, 117 N. Y., 1..... 31

PAGE

People of N. Y. vs. North River Sugar Refining Co., 121 N. Y., 582, 9 L. R. A., 33 ..... 24
Prentis vs. Southern Railroad Co., 211 U. S., 210 ... 29
Purity Extract Co. vs. Lynch, 226 U. S., 197 ..... 64, 68
Railroad vs. Bryne, 119 Tenn., 278, 291, 292 ..... 30
Rail & River Co. vs. Yappel, 236 U. S., 338 ..... 30, 34
Rast vs. Van Denman, 240 U. S., 342-358 ..... 67
Ribnik vs. McBride (U. S.), decided 5-28-28 ..... 41
Richardson vs. Young, 122 Tenn., 471, 522-24 ..... 59
Sallee vs. Dalton, 213 S. W., 762 ..... 59
Schollenberger vs. Pennsylvania, 171 U. S., 1 ..... 27
Schmidinger vs. Chicago, 226 U. S., 578, 57 L. Ed., 364 ..... 34
Shea vs. Mining Co., 55 Montana, 522 ..... 59
Sinking Fund Cases, 99 U. S., 718 ..... 28
Smith vs. State, 16 Pickle (100 Tenn.), 505 ..... 32
Sparrow vs. Strong, 3 Wallace, 97, 104 ..... 27
Spring Valley Water Co., vs. Schettler, 110 U. S., 347 45
Stafford vs. Wallace, 258 U. S., 495 ..... 30
Standard Oil Co. vs. State, 117 Tenn., 618 ..... 8, 37
Standard Oil Co. vs. Missouri, 224 U. S., 761 ..... 37, 62
Standard Oil Co. vs. State, 217 U. S., 817 .....9, 37, 39
Standard Oil Co. of N. J. vs. U. S., 221 U. S., 1 ...12, 37, 62
Standard Oil Co. vs. State, 107 Miss., 227 ..... 37
State vs. Edwards, 86 Mo., 102 ..... 44
State vs. Standard Oil Co., 173 Fed., 177 ..... 62
State vs. Fairmont Creamery Co., 153 Iowa, 702, 42 L. R. A. (N. S.), 821 ..... 63
State vs. Bridgman & R. Co., 117 Minn., 186 ..... 63
State vs. Drayton, 82 Neb., 254, 23 L. R. A. (N. S.), 1287 ..... 63
State, ex rel Young vs. Standard Oil Co., 111 Minn., 85 ..... 63
State vs. Trewhitt, 113 Tenn., 561, 572 ..... 59
State vs. Wilson, 101 Kansas, 789, 806 ..... 58
State vs. Howitt, 107 Kansas, 423 ..... 57
State, ex rel Watson vs. Standard Oil Co., 49 Ohio State, 137, 15 L. R. A., 156 ..... 24, 37
State vs. Standard Oil Co., 120 Tenn., 86 .....9, 37, 39, 62
State vs. Standard Oil Co., 218 Mo., 1 ..... 37

PAGE

State, ex rel. vs. Brewing Co., 104 Tenn., 715, 740.. 30
Stone vs. Mississippi, 101 U. S., 814..... 32
Terminal Taxicab Co. vs. District of Columbia, 241 U. S., 251, 254..... 44
Towles & Co. vs. Miles, 131 Tenn., 79..... 25
Tyson vs. Banton, 264 U. S., 140.....41, 55, 56
U. S. vs. Teschmaker, 22 Howard, 392..... 27
Van Dyke vs. Geary, 244 U. S., 39, 47..... 45, 46
Waters Pierce Oil Co. vs. Texas, 212 U. S., 86..... 37
Weller vs. New York, 268 U. S., 319, 322..... 55, 57
Williams vs. Fears, 179 U. S., 270, 276..... 25
Wolff Packing Co. vs. Court of Industrial Relations, 262 U. S., 522, 535, 536, 538-41.....30, 33, 44, 50, 58
Yeiser vs. Dysart, 267 U. S., 538..... 25

TEXT BOOKS CITED

Cook on Corporations, 6 Ed., Sec. 709..... 24
Cooley on Constitutional Limitations, p. 707..... 31
Morowitz on Private Corp., Sec. 227..... 24

STATUTES CITED

Public Acts of Tennessee for 1903, Ch. 140..... 53
Public Acts of Tennessee for 1927, Ch. 22..... 72